## Exhibit 8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

STATE OF TEXAS,

Plaintiff,

: Docket No. CA 12-128

VS.

Washington, D.C.

: Friday, July 13, 2012 9:05 a.m.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., in his : official capacity as Attorney General of :

(Day Five)

the United States,

Defendant, and

ERIC KENNIE, et al.,

Defendant-Intervenors. :

-----x

TRANSCRIPT OF BENCH TRIAL BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAVID S. TATEL UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE THE HONORABLE ROSEMARY M. COLLYER THE HONORABLE ROBERT L. WILKINS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

## APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff: ADAM MORTARA, Esquire

ASHA L. I. SPENCER, Esquire JOHN M. HUGHES, Esquire

Bartlit Beck Herman Palenchar & Scott LLP 54 West Hubbard Street

Suite 300

Chicago, IL 60654

Appearances continued:

For the Plaintiff: JONATHAN F. MITCHELL, Esquire

MATTHEW FREDERICK, Esquire PATRICK SWEETEN, Esquire STACEY NAPIER, Esquire

Office of Attorney General of Texas

209 West 14th Street, 7th Floor

Austin, TX 78701

For the Defendant: ELIZABETH S. WESTFALL, Esquire

DANIEL J. FREEMAN, Esquire

MEREDITH E.B. BELL-PLATTS, Esquire

BRUCE I. GEAR, Esquire

JENNIFER L. MARANZANO, Esquire

BRYAN L. SELLS, Esquire U.S. Department of Justice 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20530

For Defendant-Intervenors:

EZRA D. ROSENBERG, Esquire

Dechert LLP

902 Carnegie Center

Suite 500

Princeton, NJ 08540-6531

JOSEPH GERALD HEBERT, Esquire

J. Gerald Hebert, P.C.
191 Somervelle Street,

Suite 405

Alexandria, VA 22304

NANCY ABUDU, Esquire

American Civil Liberties Union

Foundation, Inc.

230 Peachtree Street NW

Suite 1440

Atlanta, GA 30303

CHAD W. DUNN, Esquire

Brazil & Dunn

4201 FM 1960 West

Suite 530

Houston, Texas 77068

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think even when we, once we actually talked to some of the agencies, it was unclear even if we had started way earlier that we could get the data in time. So we went about figuring it out. JUDGE TATEL: That's not what record shows, sir. I had a hearing where we went through that chapter and verse, sir. You could have gotten it from some of these agencies in as short of two or three weeks. MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, I wasn't participating in that hearing. I'm sorry and I'm not totally familiar with the details. But given what happened, the way we analyzed whether Texans possessed all forms of SB 14 ID was to conduct a survey asking those questions which again, Professor Ansolabehere suggested was a valid methodological approach. I want to turn now to what I call show stopper number two on Professor Ansolabehere's approach which is he employed the same flawed approach that brought down the database match in Crawford. Mr. Mortara showed in his opening the Crawford District Court opinion that said the database match there was hopelessly

Mr. Mortara showed in his opening the Crawford District Court opinion that said the database match there was hopelessly flawed because the expert in Crawford did not attempt to clean the bloated voter rolls and the Supreme Court did not disturb that holding of course.

Here the undisputed evidence from the testimony of Keith

```
1
   Ingram, the director of Texas Elections is that the Texas rolls
 2
   are bloated.
 3
           It's also undisputed that Professor Ansolabehere did
 4
   nothing to clean the registered voter list. He cleaned the DPS
 5
   but not the registered voter list, and that's why we have over
 6
   50,000 dead people that Professor Ansolabehere said will be
   disenfranchised and hundreds of thousands of people like
 7
 8
   Mr. Mortara's brother-in-law Mr. Craft, our law partner Mr.
 9
   Byers who the Department of Justice says will be
10
   disenfranchised who moved.
11
          Those are nice celebrity examples that Mr. Mortara
12
   showed yesterday but there are categorical problems with what
13
   Professor Ansolabehere did and it's exactly the same thing that
   brought down the list in Crawford, and the fact that he didn't
14
15
   clean the rolls and that the rolls are bloated, those are
16
   undisputed facts and sufficient to bring down his analysis.
17
              JUDGE COLLYER: So can we now take this down? It's
18
   in the way of people.
19
             MR. HUGHES: I was going to come to it later.
20
              JUDGE COLLYER: Never mind.
21
             MR. HUGHES: The third show stopper, and this
22
   requires a little bit more explanation is Professor
23
   Ansolabehere employed a completely biased matching protocol.
24
   We are aware of the bias against women. I won't spend any time
25
   on that.
```